

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed June 3, 2003 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claim 12 is added. Claims 1-12 are pending in this application, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action mailed June 3, 2003, claims 1-5, 8, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,974,822 (Richter).

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Richter in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,967,767 (Seragnoli).

Before discussing the cited prior art and the Examiner's rejections of the claims in view of that art, a brief summary of the present invention is appropriate. The present invention relates to a folding unit in which a web 17 is drawn into the folding unit through run-in rollers 3. The web 17 subsequently passes through first and second drawing rollers 4, 5. The web 17 then passes through a cross cutting arrangement 2 which has a cutting blade 13 shown in Fig. 2 with recesses 15 such that the cutting blade does not completely separate the web strand 18 of the web 17. Instead crosspieces 19 remain on strand so that the downstream part of the web, i.e., product 10, remains connected to the strand 18. The product 10 of the web 17 then passes through a third drawing apparatus 6 and then through accelerating and tear off rollers 7, 8 which tear the product 10 at the cross pieces to separate the product 10 from the web strand 18.

Independent claim 1 recites "a cross-cutting arrangement including a cutting cylinder and at least one cutting blade carried on said cutting cylinder functional for cutting a product from a feeding web strand fed along the product strand path, said at least one cutting blade having a plurality of recesses functioning to leave residual crosspieces in said feeding web

strand by which said product remains connected to said feeding web strand" and "accelerating and tearing-off cams at a location between said cross-cutting arrangement and said collecting cylinder through which said product passes, said accelerating and tearing-off cams operable for gripping said product to tear off said product from said feeding web strand at said residual crosspieces".

Richter discloses a sheet product folding and handling apparatus in which a web 2 is drawn through two pulling roller pairs 3, 4 and fed through a cutter blade cylinder pair 5. The Examiner states that the cutter blade cylinder pair 5 has at least three recesses. However, Richter specifically states in col. 3, lines 17-18, the cutter blade cylinder pair 5 cuts the web into a plurality of cut portions 201-205. Furthermore, Richter further states at col. 3, lines 25-30, that the belt drive system which includes tear rollers 8, 9 accelerate the cut sheet portions 201, 205 to the circumferential speed of the collection cylinder 10. In view of these remarks, Richter fails to disclose that the cutting blade has "a plurality of recesses functioning to leave residual crosspieces in said feeding web strand by which said product remains connected to said feeding web strand", as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Richter.

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Seragnoli discloses a device for feeding flaccid transparent wrapping material to a wrapping position. According to Seragnoli, a web of the wrapping material is fed through feed rolls 8, 9 between plates 2, 3. The web of flaccid wrapping material is perforated along a line t such that it remains connected to the upstream web N. Rolls 14, 15, 16, 17, and 20, 21 guide the perforated web to the wrapping position. Rolls 18, 19 separate the sheet S from the rest of the band while rolls 14, 15, 16, 17, and 20, 21, which are situated upstream and downstream of the rolls 18, 19, hold the material sheet.

Although the device of Seragnoli and Richter both feed webs, that is where the similarity ends. Those skilled in the art of folding formers would not be motivated to look at a machine for handling flaccid wrapping material. The object of the present invention is to prevent smearing of ink on the web being processed in the folder (see page 3, lines 2-3). There is no indication that the wrapping material of Seragnoli includes print. It is respectfully submitted that one skilled in the art would not be motivated to look at a device for handling flaccid wrapping material to achieve the object of the present invention. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Seragnoli with Richter. Therefore claims 6 and 7 are also allowable over Richter in view of Seragnoli.

The application is now deemed to be in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

By



Alfred W. Froebich  
Reg. No. 38,887  
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210  
New York, New York 10176  
(212) 687-2770

Dated: November 3, 2003